

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 30 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are presently pending in the application. Claim 14 is in independent form. Claims 1-13 and 15 are withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under § 103 over Robey in view of VanDenberg. Robey does not disclose downwardly depending hangers for supporting forward and rearward suspension assemblies. The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to modify Robey with the hangers taught in VanDenberg "to provide a tandem axle that is roll stable and resistant to lateral deflection." The Examiner references Column 1, Lines 7-14 of VanDenberg in support of this motivation. The Examiner's rejection is improper because the Examiner has taken the stated motivation out of context. As discussed in column 1, lines 7-14 of VanDenberg, the VanDenberg invention relates to a parallelogram suspension system, which is roll stable and resistant to lateral deflection. However, this feature does not arise from the presence of hangers. Rather, VanDenberg clearly teaches that this advantage is the result of the stabilizer bar 31 and bushings 63 and 68. See for example, col. 6, lines 39-48; col. 7, lines 16-27, lines 34-42; and col. 8, lines 17-21. Additionally, parallelogram suspensions may be used without hangers. For at least these reasons, the motivation and rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 16 and 21-23 were rejected under § 103 over Christenson in view of Hutchens. Christenson fails to teach the claimed hangers. The Examiner relies upon Hutchens for these hangers and argues that it would be obvious to modify Christenson to produce a "suspension unit with a minimum number of parts and fabricating steps." The rejection is improper because the hangers of Hutchens would serve no benefit to Christenson for at least two reasons. First, Hutchens teaches that integral hangers may be desirable for suspensions having adjustable torque arms where adjustment of the torque arms cannot correct a misalignment in the suspension frame. Christenson nowhere discloses the use of torque arms, and even if it did, does not suggest that adjustment of the torque arms could not achieve alignment. Second, Christenson teaches a suspension arrangement (shown in Figure 7) having suspension mounts 86 and suspension members 87 suitable for use in the stretch trailer mixer disclosed in Christenson. That is, there is nothing in either reference that indicates the hangers in associated suspension arrangement in Hutchens would be an improvement to that used in Christenson or that Christenson would in any way benefit from the hangers of Hutchens given the suspension

AUG 30 2006


arrangement that exists in Hutchens. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claim 19 was rejected under § 103 over Christenson in view of Hutchens and Garcia in further view of Pierce. Claim 19 recites triangular-shaped braces having a U-shaped cross-section secured between lateral portions of first and second plates and first and second spaced apart longitudinal members. While Pierce may disclose triangular-shaped braces, it only discloses them used in the open portion of each main member 121 (col. 6, lines 33-34). Nothing in Pierce would suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill to incorporate the triangular-shaped braces at the location required by Claim 19. Without such a motivation as to location of these braces, the rejection is improper.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If any fees or extensions of time are required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS



William S. Gottschalk
Registration No. 44,130
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
0(248) 988-8360

Dated: August 30, 2006